BACONIANA

VOL. XXIX. No. 116. July 1945

EDITORIAL NOTES.

LOS IDOLOS DE BACON. We have just received from the British Council in London a brochure with this title, published at Suere, Bolivia, by the University of St. Francis Xavier, under the date of 1942. The Author is Guillermo Francovich.

The pamphlet opens with a brief sketch of the two Bacons, Roger and Francis, devoting only a few lines to each. But the few lines devoted to Francis Bacon contain the usual calumnies of the writer who has accepted the aspersions of Macaulay, and other detractors of Bacon's character, without troubling to consult the judgment of his contemporaries or the considered opinions of Hepworth Dixon and James Spedding. It is curious that a student of Bacon's philosophy like Senor Francovich should find no difficulty in reconciling the author of such a noble and inspired philosophy as that of Francis Bacon with a man whom he describes thus,—we quote his words—"Such was the brilliance and charm of his intellect that the authorship of the Shakespeare Drama has been attributed to him. But at the same time his moral character was so besmirched that Pope, the English poet, called him the wisest and meanest of the human race. A despoiler, vain and disloyal man, he was prosecuted for debts and finally imprisoned in the Tower of London as a "prevaricador."

Such is the character Senor Francovich is contented to accept as that of the greatest English Philosopher and the Father of modern science.

Senor Francovich has followed the lead of English biographers in mistaking the meaning of the word "mean," which Pope used in the sense of "humble," the original meaning of the word. The secondary sense, "mean," as used to-day, has almost completely swamped the original meaning.

Senor Francovich discusses the four "idols," explaining the meaning assigned to them by Bacon, and their very real existence, both in ancient and modern times. The man of culture's view of the world, says Senor Francovich, is characterised by its transparency. Thanks to the progress of science, Thought knows the past of men and things and contemplates the most distant depths of the universe, without meeting therein arbitrary shadows and mysteries . . . Thanks to the aid of perfected instruments nature is revealed as unity pervading both vegetable and heavenly body alike. This view of the universe appears so simple, so harmonious that it seems to us that

man has only to open his eyes to see it. We have the impression that this clarity of perception is an inherent property of thought and that the mystical shadows, the magical and demoniacal illusions, the confused or chaotic conceptions which we meet in its primitive forms are but pathological manifestations of mental life. This however is not the case. Man has acquired that clear vision of things as the result of a prolonged and painful effort of observation and reasoning. Its creation and maintenance have needed all the intellectual work which has preceded the present age in our history. Man is not rational, he makes himself rational . . . . Our Author then quotes Bacon's maxim approvingly (Bk. I, Aph. 41, Nov. Org.), "The human understanding is like a false mirror, which, receiving rays irregularly, distorts and discolours the nature of things by mingling its own nature with it." Mr. Francovich treats each of the four Idols in turn, explaining them and their fundamental rooting in the human mind, hindering the clear perception, and hence the power to deal with the interpretation, of Nature. We may quote a few lines from the opening of his discussion of the Idols of The Theatre:

"When Bacon speaks of the Idols of the theatre he refers to the dogmas and philosophical systems, elaborated in the past to explain nature. Bacon compares them with theatrical farces, systematically built up with much skill, made to seduce the mind and impress on it a purposed image of the world. In Bacon's opinion these Idols of the theatre were the most dangerous because in his age the principle of authority was dominant over men's opinion. The writings of the Ancients and the Sacred books were considered as the fountain of all knowledge and man's intellectual beliefs were confined by the authority of Aristotle and the Church. Bacon was the protagonist to rebel against the authority and denounced the retention of crumbling beliefs of other ages and urged the necessity of adapting thought to real experiment on things and nature."

Thus Senor Francovich describes the aim of Bacon's philosophy and shows its great influence on modern thought and science which has freed itself, to a certain extent, from the ancient trammels of the four idols. But he concludes, "From the rapid sketch we have made it follows that rationalism, as conceived by the cultured man of the day, is not an indispensible factor in life. Most of us act as automatons, custom is a second nature. Our spirit rests on certain simple ideas, many of them as old as humanity itself. Humanity has a predisposition to faith. The child is credulous, as well as primitive man, we too are the same in the midst of our daily necessities. We are creatures both fallible and subject to our passions, alternatively generous and cruel. The generality of mankind is incapable of that objectivity, that balance, which rationalism demands. For the majority truth or reality serves only as a form of utility. He thus is a realist who is in agreement with our interests or desires. We need firm opinions which are beyond criticism and doubt. We need absolute affirmations to stimulate action, beliefs which while strength-

ening institutions, unify the conscious and unconscious. Add that we men delight to feel ourselves on a solid intellectual ground, forming common mental realities and the more homogeneous our ideas the greater is our feeling of security. For all this, reason, with its objective analyses and its critical exegesis presents itself as a disturbing element of life. Reason destroys our illusions, paralyses the free expansion of our life, and neglects the picture and colour of reality.'' "Yet—he continues—''although the masses are happy in their illusions and idols and indeed are unfitted naturally and unable intellectually, to free themselves, it is the duty and privilege of philosophers and savants to free their own minds and intellects for the purpose of guiding the masses in the paths of science and progress and though they cannot bring the mass mind up to their own intellectual place, they can purify the Idols which must dominate the masses, and render them less obstructive in mankind's forward march.''

Whilst we acknowledge Senor Francovich's able exposition of the Idols of Bacon, we regret that he does not apply Bacon's method of reasoning and objective Study of our Great Philosopher's life and character instead of blindly following the Idols of mis-informed opinion. And what false Idols they are!

Another new book on Shakespeare's learning—this time his latinity—has appeared. The author is C.S. Montgomery, a teacher of latin in Australia. The title of the book is ''Shakespearean Afterglow.'' The book is not yet procurable in London, but from a review of it in John O' London's Weekly of 6th April we gather that one object of the book is to demonstrate Shakespeare's profound knowledge of the latin tongue and that he employed this knowledge in a way not used by Bacon.

For example, the way he uses the equivalent of the latin word ''carere.'' Miss Montgomery maintains that when Shakespeare uses the word ''lack'' he is thinking of and translating the latin word ''carere,'' whereas Bacon uses the word ''want'' to express the same meaning. But the words ''want'' and ''lack'' are both of Icelandic origin and mean precisely the same thing; neither has more affinity to the latin word ''carere'' than the other. Lewis and Short's big latin dictionary gives as the primary meaning of ''carere'' ''to be cut off from, be without, want, be in want of, not to have,'' and the English derivative from ''carere'' is ''to shear.''

So much for the meaning of ''carere.'' Now let us see if Bacon uses the word ''lack.'' On turning to Spedding's ''Life and letters of Francis Bacon'' in a letter addressed to Lord Burleigh dated 18th October, 1580, we find Bacon asking his uncle to use his influence with the Queen to give him employment under the Crown; and using these words, ''true it is that I must needs acknowledge myself prepared and furnished thereunto with nothing but a multitude of *lacks* and Imperfections.''

Bacon must have been thinking of "carere" according to Miss Montgomery's reasoning. It is not improbable that if one had the time to search through the 7 volumes of Bacon's correspondence and Political papers one would find many other examples of the use of the word, as he was not in the habit of making a single use of ordinary words. But let us turn to Shakespeare. Take Hamlet for example, I, 2; "a beast that *wants* discourse of reason" or The Tempest, III.3; "although they *want* the use of tongue." and again IV, 1; "now I *want* spirits to enforce," take Coriolanus III, 1; "*wants* not spirit to say." The word want in the sense of *lack* is used over and over again by Shakespeare throughout the plays. What latin word was he thinking of? He was probably not thinking of "carere" at all when he used *lack* or *want*, though Bacon and Shakespeare are in good company with Messrs. Lewis and Short when they use the word *want* in the sense of "carere." Now let us see whether Bacon makes use of the latin grammatical form of the ablative absolute. We took up Bacon's History of Henry the Seventh and opened the book at random, which happened to be page 69, and running our eyes down the page, at line 10, came on the following sentence, "He (Henry) went on as far as Yorke to pacifie and settle the countries, *and that done*, returned to London." Again on page 71, second paragraph, line 5, we find the following, "but the former Parliament being ended, etc." And on page 123, line 15 up; we read, "that they smothered them in their bed (the two little princes) *and that done*, called up their master to see," etc. Also on page 124, lines 7 and 8; "Therefore *that kind of proof being left so naked*," etc., as will be seen these are but a few taken at random out of 50 consecutive pages of one work.

Turning now to a different category of Miss Montgomery's special pleading for Shaksper against Bacon, let us examine his argument. She says, "Bacon's Latin is conscious," his Essays teem with quotations drawn from writers such as Seneca, Suetonius, Tacitus, Horace and Juvenal, whereas Shakespeare does not use Latin quotations at all. This is quite true, and is no more than we should expect. Whilst Latin quotations are suitable in the case of the Essays, they would be entirely out of place in plays meant to be acted before a public which was uneducated and on whom a display of latinity would have been thrown away. When comparing Shakespeare with Bacon, one must remember that in his philosophical works, he was writing for the learned, but in the works of his recreation, amongst which is his "History of Henry VII," we find a wide difference of style. This latter book is strongly dramatic in parts and is written in a manner which holds the reader as few, if any, modern historians can do.

But if Shakespeare does not quote excerpts from Latin authors, he borrows extensively from them, at times translating almost literally from them. A good example has been pointed out by Mr. Eagle in his book, "Shakespeare: New Views for old," Where in "The Merchant of Venice," II, 5; there is a passage taken directly

from Horace's Odes, III, 7; in which Shylock bids his daughter Jessica shut the house and keep in doors.

If Shakespeare's verse can with such facility be turned into latin, it should not be a matter of surprise because so much of it is taken from the thought and text of latin writers, and dramatic style facilitates it owing to the artificial sequence of words so often needed by the requirements of metre. But what constitutes style? Bacon says—"Poesy, a kind of learning, is in words constrained, in matter loose and licens'd, (Adv. Learn., II, 13, Watts 1640), so that it is referred to the Imagination, which devises and contrives unequal and unlawful matches and divorces of things and, as has been already noted, is taken in a double sense as it respects words or matter." And again he says, "Verse is a kind of style and form of elocution and pertains not to matter."

If this were but borne in mind, we should not hear so much about difference in style.

With regard to classical knowledge and unconscious use of latin idiom generally, and especially to Ben Jonson's remark anent Shakspere that he had small latin and less greek, we may assume, without impropriety, that old Ben was making a subtle distinction between Shaksper the actor and Shakespeare the dramatic author. The countryman indeed, could have had but small latin and less greek, if any at all. Even if he did attend the grammar school at Stratford, of which there is no record, slender would his chance have been of acquiring anything but the merest elements of latin grammar, and no greek at all. We can have no doubt that Old Ben knew perfectly well what he was talking about.

Baconians may justly claim to have been the first to point out the classical learning of the Author of the Shakespeare plays and the universal knowledge so profusely scattered throughout the writings, whilst until quite recently orthodox commentators have consistently maintained the un-learning of the supposed author, the man of Stratford, because it was universally admitted that he had no learning. Nowadays, however, the wide and deep learning of the author having been demonstrated beyond a doubt, it is the endeavour of the orthodox, in complete contradiction to their predecessors, to try to prove that the man of Stratford had scholarship of the ripest degree in order to fit him into the place which he could not otherwise possibly occupy.

Whilst we disagree fundamentally with the thesis put forward by Miss Montgomery as to the different kind of classical learning and its usage by Bacon and Shakespeare respectively, we are nevertheless grateful to her for demonstrating so clearly the classical attainments of the Author.

We publish on another page, a reply sent to John O' London's review which the Editor of that Journal reduced to such microscopic proportions, by extensive cuts in the text, as to take away all point from Mr. Eagle's letter.

In *The Sphere* of the 24th May, Mr. Gore seeks to make Gammon of the "Baconians," but they are not his meat; and although they may bore the writer, they must continue to bore to get at the heart of the mystery surrounding the true Author of the Shakespeare plays. "Rasher and rasher," is indeed the word, for a boar may gore the rash intruder into his lair. But we have no quarrel with, nor do we desire to spill the gore of, our adventurer; for we understand that Mr. Gore was very much impressed with the masterly exposition of our case as set forth in Mr. R. L. Eagle's book, "New Views for Old."

The only question with which we are concerned here is Mr. Gore's suggestion that the Northumberland Manuscript might be a forgery.

To this we would say, first, that the evidence contained in the MSS. is not a primary prop for the thesis of the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare plays, and, in the second place, that our case is not so weak that we require to bolster it up with forged evidence. We leave such questionable devices to Shakespearean Commentators. However that may be, it is apparent that the Stratford camp is more than somewhat worried about the implications involved in the revelations of the Northumberland MSS. Now as to the authenticity of these documents, we would refer Mr. Gore to their history and to the late* Mr. Spedding's finding thereon, for although he was a great admirer of Bacon, and has produced the standard edition of his life and works, he did not support the Bacon-Shakespeare thesis. He had examined the documents thoroughly and was a man well qualified to pronounce on the genuineness or otherwise of Tudor and Jacobean documents. He accepted, without any qualifications, the authenticity of the Northumberland MSS. and there can be little doubt that he would have denounced them as forgeries if he could have done so; see his feeble endeavour to explain away the repeated linking up of the names of Bacon and Shakespeare. No, the laugh is on our side, for

> Of all the world's side splitting jokes
> The greatest is the Stratford Hoax.

L.B.

We publish in this issue, an article by Mr. Eagle seeking to prove that the celebrated title page prefixed to the Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia, and subsequently to the Spenser folio of 1611, cannot bear the interpretation commonly attributed to it by supporters of the theory of the Royal birth of Francis Bacon. The arguments put forward are plausible, such as pointing out that the two supporters in the engraving represent the two principal characters in the "Arcadia," viz. Dorus and Zelmane, the former disguised as a shepherd, the latter as an Amazon, who kill respectively a bear and a lion, figures of which are placed above their heads. This suggestion fits in well with the story and was put forward twenty

* *A Conference of Pleasure, by Francis Bacon, etc.* By Jas. Spedding. (Longmans, Green. 18 pp.)

years ago by the late Mr. E. G. Harman in his book, "The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia," tending to prove that Francis Bacon was the real author of the book. He also wrote another book claiming Spenser's works for Bacon as well.

Mr. Eagle also seeks to show that the famous pig, in the panel at the foot of the page, sniffing at the bush, is only meant to express the old idea that pigs don't like sweet scented herbs, especially sweet Marjoram, with which he identifies the plant, and that the whole thing means nothing more than "keep away vulgar folk, this book is not meant for you." Let us for the memont admit Mr. Eagle's interpretation of the emblems; ostensibly they are quite suitable for the Arcadia, but how do they apply to the Spenser folios of 1611 and 1617? The two figures cannot apply to them, we have already identified them as "Dorus" and "Zelmane." Perhaps it will be said that printers used to borrow engraved titles (as well as blocks) which they thought elegant or ornamental and prefixed them indiscriminately to any work they had in hand, without regard to their suitability to the subject matter of the book. Can such a theory be tenable? I think not. Besides the Spencer Folio we find this same title page prefixed in 1595 to a translation by T.B. of "The Florentine History," by Nicholas Macchiavelli, &c., this same title page is also found in an anonymous translation of Boccacio's "Decameron," or "Ten days Entertainment" printed in 1625, and perhaps in other works also, though I cannot recall any other off-hand.

Now if we are to find a feasible explanation of this peculiar title page, it seems clear that we must look in another direction, else why should it have been employed in such widely differing works? For the interpretation assigned to it by Mr. Eagle in the case of "The Arcadia" is meaningless in all the other cases mentioned. It has been said that Sir Philip Sidney, the reputed author of "The Arcadia," expressed a wish, before his death, that this work should not be published. If this really was the case it reflects little credit on the person who deliberately disregarded the wishes of a dead man. Mr. Bertram Dobell, in the Quarterly Review of July, 1909, points out the discrepancies contained in Sir Philip Sidney's letter and the epistle to the reader by H.S., in relation to the actual facts of the case, and Mr. Harman states that this bears out his own conclusion that both the letter, attributed to Sir Philip Sidney, and the epistle to the reader are simply and purely forgeries, or perhaps we should say fictitious, concocted by the true author to conceal his own identity, and to cast dust in the eyes of the unwary. The similarity of style in the two documents is apparent. This being so we must accept any statements made by H.S. as being highly seasoned with salt.

The same remark applies equally to the apparent meaning of the emblematic figures on the title page.

In the first edition, a quarto, the title page dated 1590, bears only the crest, motto and coat of Arms of Sir Philip Sidney, apart from the printed title. The engraved title under consideration

appeared first in the second edition, a small folio much enlarged in contents, in 1593. In this case the reader will note that the animal at the top representing (?) Sidney's crest is a mere travesty of a porcupine, it has the head of a boar complete with tusks, the body of a pig or porcupine and the feet of a coney, or perhaps a porcupine. The quills are very sparse. It is in fact a fine example of an hybrid. (Poor Sidney!) If Mr. Harman's theory of Baconian authorship be accepted, then we begin to see some light. Sidney was dead, so his name could be used to cloak the true author, and the title page must be regarded as of Baconian origin and consequently full of subtle meaning and capable of double interpretation. It should be remembered that the pig in the panel at the foot of the page is practically identical with the emblem in Camerarius on page 103, the numerical symbol for Shakespeare. Whatever the plant may be, it is clearly not the same as that in the emblem of Camerarius. From the foregoing I think we are justified in claiming that this engraved title is meant to have another meaning besides the ostensible interpretation which is a "springe to catch woodcocks" (Hamlet I. 3.), in short a device that might have been employed by Zeynab* the Coney-catcher. Now the interpretation offered by the Royal Birth thesis has none of these objections; it does not depend on the book for an explanation, but tells its own story.

THE 46th PSALM.

We have received a letter from Mr. W. R. Payne, of Plymouth, drawing attention to an important point not mentioned in Mr. Rose's article, namely, the extraordinary coincidence (was it?) of the reputed birth and death dates of Shakesper on the 23rd of April; the combined total of these two dates amounts to 46 (23 plus 23 equals 46), the serial number of this psalm, and the connection between Shakespeare, St. George's day and England is thus emphasized by the number 46. Besides this and the signature of Francis Bacon revealed by Mr. Rose, there are other striking coincidences (?) to be found in the form of numerical seals hidden in the text. For example:—

The serial number of the psalm is	46	
Add number of words down to shake	46	
Making a total of	92	BACON (R)
Again number of words down to shake	46	
Add number of words between shake and speare (including "Selah" twice repeated)	111	F. BACON (R)
Making a total of	157	Fra Rosicrosse (S)

**The Arabian Nights.*

This seal is repeated thus:—

As above words between shake and speare	111	BACON (K)
Add words up from end to speare (inc.)	46	
Making a total of	157	Fra Rosicrosse (S)

N.B. The final "Selah" is not included, as it is not included in the original count when the original 46 count of shake and speare was first noticed.

Then again, if to the upper count of (from "God" to "shake")	46	
we add the lower count of (from the end to "speare")	46	
we obtain a second count of	92	BACON (R)

Now let us take the grand total, still omitting the final "Selah"	46	
	111	
	46	
		Shakespeare, 103
Making a total of	203	Francis Bacon, 100
Shakespeare plus Francis Bacon	203	203

It will be noticed that if we include the final word "Selah" the total count will be 203 plus 1 equals 204.

Now there is one more word separated from the text of the Psalm by the brief analysis, and that word is PSAL, IN LARGE Roman letters. By the rules of ciphering, we are permitted to make use of this differentiated word for addition or subtraction as required (like the use of Colel or Unity in the Cabalistic system of ciphering).

In this case we deduct the one word Psal from the grand total of all words, including the final word "Selah," namely, 204, which again yield the count of 203:

| | | |

SOMEBODY SAYS "BACON"

By K. M. Housden.

THE LATE E. W. SMITHSON, in his "Baconian Essays," sets forth the serious criticism that Baconians must face. This falls into three categories: (1) Ben Jonson's evidence, (2) the popular notion that Bacon was essentially a man of science, (3) the absence of conspicuous and unmistakable evidence of identity between Bacon and Shakespeare.

With regard to the first, Mr. Smithson shows that Ben Jonson's evidence was inconclusive. The 1623 Folio, he thinks, was put together after Bacon's fall by his friends, forbidden by Bacon to identify him with the author of the Plays, so that Ben was driven to double meanings, subterfuges and, in his reference to the "Sweet Swan of Avon," to "a *suggestio falsi* carried to the verge of a lie," being morally absolved therefrom through the purity of his motive.

With regard to the second category, Mr. Smithson shows that Bacon was essentially a man of letters and a poet. He quotes passages from Bacon's speech in 1592 in Praise of Knowledge and comments on it thus: "These are not the views, nor is this the accent, of one who has been devoting himself to natural science. The utterance is that of a genius for letters whose preoccupation has been the apparelling of beautiful thoughts in beautiful words." He brings forward the testimony of the collection of epigrams published by Dr. William Rawley in 1626 after Bacon had passed away—the *Manes Verulamiani*—in which Bacon is referred to as "the Apollo of our choir," "the hinge of the literary world," "the Morning Star of the Muses" and in other phrases which show that the authors "regarded Bacon not merely as a poet but as the foremost poet of the age." Although Professor Fowler considered that the foundation of the Royal Society was due to the impulse given by Bacon to experimental science, Mr. Smithson demurs: "I cannot help doubting whether, if Bacon had died before 1620 or thereabouts, he would have been held to have placed experimental science under any obligation at all."

It may be noted that Mr. Edwin Reed also held this point of view, to some extent, in his book "Bacon versus Shakspere," showing that Bacon completely disregarded contemporary scientists such as Galileo, Harvey, Kepler and others, all of whom represented the method we call Baconian. Mr. Reed maintains that this must be taken into consideration in forming any correct estimate of Bacon. This anomaly has been variously interpreted and Mr. Reed's opinion is that Bacon was a poet first, a philosopher second: "Over and above his other faculties towered the creative—that which gave eloquence to his tongue, splendour to his style, and an exhaustless illumination to his whole being."

With regard to the third category, the lack of conspicuous and unmistakable evidence of identity between Bacon and Shakespeare, Mr. Smithson demonstrates that since the beginning of the controversy a great mass of facts has been piled up and is being added to from day to day, testifying to such a connection—evidence of every kind and quality. There are countless parallelisms between Bacon's works and Shakespeare's, endless similarities of thought and utterance, even of error. There is the law in the plays and poems: there is the existence of the Northumberland MSS. with the names "Francis Bacon" and "William Shakespeare" scribbled many times in juxtaposition on the cover, this at a time before the latter name was ever used on a title page, and the listing on this cover of two Shakespeare Plays, Richard II and Richard III, at that time still unpublished, along with works known to be Bacon's own.

In addition to such evidence as Mr. Smithson outlines, the Rev. Walter Begley, in "Is it Shakespeare?" long ago demonstrated convincingly that veiled though obvious allusions to Shakespeare's identity appear in the "Satires" of Hall and Marston and in the works of other contemporary writers. And, more recently, the acrostic signatures worked into the fabric of the plays and poems after the fashion of the ancient Greeks, which have been discovered and published by Mr. Alfred Mudie, together with others of a different type but of an equally indisputable nature, for the revealing of which Mr. Edward D. Johnson is to be thanked, clearly set their seal upon the question of authorship.

Thus of both internal and external evidence there seems no lack. Yet, as Begley remarked in his "Bacon's Nova Resuscitatio," direct mention was still needed. The critics turn deaf ears. "Nobody says Bacon," they argue, and declare the matter settled.

The lists thus still remaining open, several other claimants have meanwhile appeared, each with his own following. Among these the Earls of Oxford and Derby are the most notably championed.

Unlike Mr. Smithson, who thought that Bacon suppressed all the evidence in question to avoid harmful scandal to himself—the pirated edition of the Sonnets, for example, over which Coke, intending evil, would exult, would not stand him in good stead in his political career—the Rev. Walter Begley put the prevailing silence down to a wholesome respect of the public for Star Chamber, Court and Church. Ears and noses were easily lost in those times for injudicious remarks and this may have helped to keep wagging tongues still where anonymity was desired. Later research finds undoubted evidence of a secret in Bacon's life, a secret that is beginning to assume awesome dimensions and the existence of which, if it were proven, would alone be more than sufficient to account for the whole silence and mystery in which the problem is shrouded.

Yet someone, and that someone a contemporary, too, did say "Bacon." He spoke softly but clearly: his words were printed but so far they seem to have escaped remark.

Thomas Vaughan, mystic and occult writer, published, around 1650, several works under the pseudonym "Eugenius Philalethes." Mr. A. E. Waite, who collected and published Vaughan's Works in 1919, says of him in his "Real History of the Rosicrucians" that "he was so far connected with the Rosicrucians that he published a translation of the "Fama" and "Confessio Fraternitatis" and his philosophic doctrines are very similar to those of the mysterious Brotherhood of which he has erroneously, and despite his express and repeated denials, been represented as a member." Philalethes (says Mr. Waite) expected the advent of the Artist Elias prophesied by Paracelsus and he declared that "problematical personage" already to have been born into the world. According to him "the entire Universe is to be transmuted and transfigured by the science of this Artist into the pure mystical gold of the Spiritual City of God, when all currencies have been destroyed."

There are two references to Francis Bacon in Vaughan's works, the first as a philosopher whose science was that of the Hermetic school. Here he is called Lord Verulam: the reference is thus obviously to him and not to his namesake Roger Bacon. This alone confirms the contention that Bacon is not the forerunner of what is called Science to-day. His philosophy, despite his opinion of Aristotle, followed the lines of the Ancient Tradition. M. Wittemans, Member of the Belgian Senate, writing in 1932, states that Bacon was "the greatest figure who has ever existed among the Rosicrucians." (It may be mentioned in parenthesis that M. Wittemans confirms Mr. Waite's statement that Thomas Vaughan was not a Rosicrucian and he quotes Westcott as naming Robert Fludd (1574-1637) as the first Magus in England, with Sir Kenelm Digby as his successor: this indeed gives rise to the question, when then could Bacon himself have been their head, as presumably he must at some time have been?) However, to proceed with the words of Vaughan, which begin his "Aula Lucis" (published 1651):

"I have resolved with myself to discourse of Light and to deliver it over to the hands of posterity, a practise certainly very ancient and first used by those who were first wise. It was used then for charity, not for pomp, the designs of those authors having nothing in them of glory but much of benefit. It was not their intention to brag that they themselves did see but to lead those who in some sense were blind and did not see. To effect this they proceeded not as some modern barbarians do—by clamourous, malicious disputes. A calm instruction was proposed and, that being once rejected, was never afterwards urged, so different and remote a path from the schoolroom did they walk in, and verily they might well do it, for their principles being once resisted they could not inflict a greater punishment on their adversaries than to conceal them. Had their doctrine been such as the universities profess now their silence indeed had been a virtue, but their positions were not mere noise and notion. They were most deep experimental secrets, and those of infinite use and

benefit. Such a tradition then as theirs was may wear that style of the noble Verulam and is most justly called a Tradition of the Lamp."

This serene attitude represented the calm after the storm. Shortly before, Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, unable to penetrate the significance of Vaughan's writings, which were set out with that deliberate obscurity demanded by the Hermetic code, had assailed them violently, with not unnatural results. A wordy warfare ensued: pamphlets flew to and fro: the controversy grew bitter. A friend of Vaughan's, signing himself "P.B., A.M. Oxoniens," composed a poem in his defence, which was prefixed to Vaughan's "Magia Adamica" (published 1650). It is in this poem that the second reference to Francis Bacon occurs. As the allusion is to *drama*, and to one drama in particular—to a Shakespeare Play, in fact—it is clear once again that it is not Roger Bacon who is intended:

> "'Twas well he did assault thee, or thy foe
> Could not have hit to thy advantage so.
> What he styles ignorance is depth in sense:
> He thinks there is no skill but common sense.
> Had Bacon lived in this unknowing age
> And seen experience laughed at on the stage,
> What Tempests would have risen in his blood
> To side an art which Nature hath made good."

Here then is a small piece of evidence that might claim to pass Mr. Smithson's test: those who urge that it is not particularly conspicuous must at least grant that it is unmistakable, if the lines are to have any point at all.

Who was "P.B.?" The answer should not be far to seek. Bacon's medical attendant during the latter part of his life was named Peter Boener. Spedding, in his "Life and Letters," mentions him several times, and quotes from an article in the *Athenaeum* of June 10th, 1871. It was Peter Boener who said of Bacon that "though his fortune may have changed, yet I never saw any change in his mien, his words or his deeds towards any man . . . but he was always the same, both in sorrow and in joy, as a philosopher ought to be." Describing his own duties, Boener relates also: "I seldom saw him take up a book. He only ordered his chaplain and me to look in such and such an author for a certain place, and then he dictated to us early in the morning what he had invented and composed during the night." He concludes his testimony to Bacon with a wish that a statue were erected to his memory, not because of his literary or scientific undertakings but in acknowledgement of his moral worth: "Therefore it is a thing to be wished . . that a statue in honour of him may be erected in his country as a memorable example to all of virtue, kindness, peacefulness and patience." His wish, as we know, was fulfilled, Sir Thomas Meautys providing the monument in St. Michael's Church at St. Albans, at his own expense.

Mr. W. T. Smedley, in his "Mystery of Francis Bacon," gives such a compact little account of Boener that I take the liberty of quoting it in full: "In 1647 there was published at Leyden a Dutch translation of forty-six of Bacon's Essays, the "Wisdom of the Ancients" and the 'Religious Meditations.' The translation is by Peter Boener, an apothecary of Nymegen, Holland, who was in Bacon's service for some years as domestic apothecary and occasional amanuensis, and quitted his employment in 1623. Boener added a 'Life of Bacon' which is a mere fragment, but contains testimony by a personal attendant which is of value."

Since Peter Boener's friend, Thomas Vaughan, was a chemist likewise, it may be surmised that Bacon's laboratory at Gorhambury occasionally saw them both. And as Boener also performed secretarial duties, it is not improbable that he, as well as Ben Jonson, took part in penning Bacon's MSS. and perhaps even in editing the Folio of 1623. So that when it came to writing poems, an allusion such as that under discussion would very naturally present itself to his mind.

Certainly the word "Bacon" is not a misprint, for it stands thus in the original edition of 1650. There is a profusion of capital letters here, and the poem contains almost as many words in italics as in ordinary type—so much so that one cannot help wondering whether the biliteral cipher is here making use of whole words instead of, or perhaps as well as, individual letters. This, however, is a matter for the expert only. One may note curiously that although in Mr. Waite's edition the spelling and lettering have been modernized, the word "Tempests" has been left with a capital "T." A passing reference to Digby occurs later in the poem, from which Mr. Waite has omitted the remaining stanzas, finding the controversy distasteful. The printer of the 1650 work was William Leake, of the Crowne in Fleet Street.

One would think it would naturally follow that the author of the "Tempest" was also the author of the remaining plays in the 1623 Folio, hence the mysterious "Shakespeare" himself. This assumption has, at all events, usually held the field. Mr. Colin Still, in his profound study, "Shakespeare's Mystery Play," stands aside from controversy and is content to show that the play is in keeping with Baconian philosophy and scholarship and that it represents that Eternal Theme of the Ancient Mysteries and ranks in its conception and structure with the works of Vergil and Dante. He points out that Milton and Bunyan have developed the same occult Saga nearer our own times.

The champions of the Earl of Derby, under the standard of Prof. Abel Lefranc, of the College of France, draw largely upon the "Tempest" for their own evidence. On the other hand, the followers of the Earl of Oxford, led by Mr. J. T. Looney, repudiate the play altogether. It interferes so seriously with their theory that they are forced to choose between discarding either the one or the other;

Prospero's philosophy, they maintain, is not "Shakespeare's"—that is, not Hamlet's. Whoever is Hamlet is Shakespeare and who can Hamlet be but Edward de Vere?

But while Gilbert Slater, in his "Seven Shakespeares," grudgingly allows Bacon (on the evidence of the Northumberland MSS.) the two historical plays of Richard II and Richard III, the Baconian, Mr. E. W. Smithson, thinks he sees other hands besides Bacon's in the "Tempest," yet finds this play linked up with another and yet another and finally asks himself where indeed it is possible to draw the line.

Among his Seven Shakespeares Mr. Slater includes a female hand—that of the Countess of Pembroke, mother of the "Incomparable Paire of Brethren" to whom the First Folio was dedicated. He finds there the explanation of the "Sweet Swan of Avon," since the lady dwelt near Wilton, and Wilton is on the Wiley, a little tributary of the Wiltshire Avon.

The Rev. Walter Begley finds the solution of this mystifying expression of Ben Jonson's in Bacon's own reference (De Aug. II.7), to the Swans of Ariosto's "Orlando Furioso" (Bk. XXXV, 14), which seize the medals of the famous, cut off by the shears of Atropos, and bear them away to the Temple of Immortality.

This may explain the allusion—yet one cannot help wondering why Ben Jonson dragged it in at all. There was no compulsion to use it—poets are free to choose their own material—yet here is honest Ben actually going out of his way to tell what Mr. Smithson can only regard as a deliberate falsehood, or nearly so. Stradfordians, however, swear by honest Ben. He is their staunchest prop (almost the only one remaining, indeed). "Sweet Swan of Avon"—could anything point the way more clearly? And the "Tempest" is their William's Swan-Song. But now comes P. B. linking up the Key Play in the Folio with one *Bacon*.

To be sure, his is just another voice among many, yet the critic will be hard put to it to explain exactly why he says "Bacon" when, by all the rules of the Established Order, he ought to have said "Shakespeare." It should be interesting to watch the reaction of the orthodox to his remark. Can they really continue, in the face of the broadest hints, such as this (and there is no lack of others) to avoid paying attention to the overwhelming mass of evidence already awaiting them?

That the Author should have descended from the rare atmosphere of the "Tempest," that quintessence of esoteric classicism, to the pettifogging and bookless obscurity of Stratford, there to live out his days in perfect contentment, is so incongruous a dénouement that to explain it has taxed the most fertile Stratfordian brains. Frank Harris is driven to the theory that the Man Shakespeare, his mind wrecked through his tragic love—his insane passion—for the Dark Lady, Mary Fitton, dragged himself to Stratford, in that hole, bereft of wits, to perish. Of such Fitton romances in general one

may note Sir George Greenwood's remark in his introductory essay to Mr. Smithson's book: "It is nothing to tell people who have made this wonderful discovery that Mary Fitton was *not* a "dark lady," but a *fair* lady, as her portraits at Arbury show."

In any case, the Folio of 1623 contained so many new plays and so much revision and addition to old ones, that if the Swan of Avon is to be represented as uttering his farewell song, it must be here and not ten years earlier.

Could Ben Jonson's words by any pretext apply to Bacon himself? On one theory it is surely possible.

In connection with the mystery of authorship there has come to be involved another mystery—an even yet more perplexing riddle. Even if the orthodox should eventually survive the former, it is practically certain that investigation of the latter would never be undertaken by them except under threats of torture.

A few miles to the north-east of Stratford, almost within walking distance, and near the same river Avon, stands a castle. Now, unhappily, it is a mere ruin. In 1564 it was a royal castle and the Queen bestowed it upon that subject to whom she also gave a royal title and (rumour had it) her hand in marriage. Regarding children of that marriage there was no lack of rumour: history preserves an enigmatic silence. But suppose rumour had not lied? Would not such children have looked upon their father's seat as their own home? Would not the Avon have seen them many times? Would not the memories of their early days linger here, at Kenilworth?

Who wrote that brilliant pamphlet, that description of the Kenilworth festivities in 1575, saturated with classical learning, with metaphor and imagery, glittering with new words coined from Latin and French originals, the matter of it so rich, the style of it so exuberant that ordinary speech was not enough to contain it? Who signed himself therein "El Prencipe Negro"—the Black Prince—and why?

We are told (by the author himself!) that it was Robert Laneham (or Langham—he does not seem to be too sure which), the door-keeper of the Council Chamber. General Hickson, who investigated this letter in his "Prince of Poets," has no hesitation in recognizing here the work of young Bacon, or in seeing in the Black Prince the son of Elizabeth, and the future Hamlet.

Young Bacon masquerading, under the Earl of Leicester's wing, as the Black Prince at the Kenilworth pageant? Why look to *Stratford* for the Gentle Bard of Avon?

THE ARCADIA (1593)—SPENSER (1611) TITLE PAGE.

By R. L. Eagle.

THE title-page of *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1593), which is the second and enlarged edition, "printed for William Ponsonbie," has, among other emblems (which we shall discuss later), a device showing a pig pulling up abruptly at a bush bearing the motto, "Non tibi spiro."

A similar title page (in fact the same block) was used for the 1611 Spenser folio. This was, however, printed by H.L. for Mathew Lownes. A facsimile of this title page appeared in BACONIANA, January, 1944, and is again reproduced for the assistance of readers.

A comparison of this bush with the plate depicting sweet marjoram in Gerard's *Herbal* (1597) will leave no doubt that it is intended for that plant.

There is an epistle, to the reader, in the 1593 *Arcadia*, signed "H.S." According to Aubrey, "H.S." was Henry Sanford, the Earl of Pembroke's secretary:

> Mr. Henry Sanford was the earle's secretary; a good scholar and poet, and who did penne part of the *Arcadia* dedicated to her (i.e. the Countess of Pembroke) as appears by the preface. He has a preface before it with the two letters of his name. 'Tis he that has verses before Bond's Horace.

There seems to be some doubt, however, as to whether his Christian name was Henry or Hugh.

In 1600, John Hoskins wrote a discourse on rhetoric for a private pupil in which he quoted from the first, or 1590, edition of the *Arcadia*, describing it as "the first in quarto without Samford's additions." We find the name written as Sanford, Sandford and Samford.

The title page of the 1590 edition is quite different, and merely displays the Sidney coat-of-arms. The publisher was also Ponsonby, who died in 1604.

Nashe, in *Lenten Stuffe* (1599), scoffs at H.S. as though he (whether Sanford, or another writing under those initials) designed the title page showing the pig and marjoram device:

> Most courteous unlearned lover of Poetry, and yet a Poet thyselfe, or no lesse prince than H.S., that in honour of Maid-marrian gives sweet *Marjoram* for his Empresse, and puttes the *Sowe* most sawcily upon some great personage;* what ever she bee, bidding her (as it runs in the old song). *Go from my garden go, for there no flowers for thee doth grow.*

Florio attacked H.S. in his *Worlds of Wordes* (1598), saying that H.S. could stand for *H*umfrey *S*wineshead, *H*odge *S*owgelder, &c., and concludes, "Now Master H.S. if this do gaule you, forbeare

*Presumably the Countess of Pembroke.

kicking hereafter, and in the meane time you may make you a plaister of your dride Marjoram.''

The reason for these attacks on H.S., and the allusions to marjoram in connection with swine are not easy to understand. It is, of course, well known that marjoram was used as a seasoning for pork, and perhaps from this arose the proverbial abhorrence of the pig for marjoram. One phrase book which I have consulted states that to say one likes a thing ''as a pig loves marjoram'' means that there is intense dislike of it.

After much painstaking investigation, I can now state that the plant, at which the pig is pulling up, is marjoram. In Lucretius (VI, 974) we find ''Amaracinum fugitat sus'' (*the pig shuns marjoram*).* Aulus Gellius, in the preface to *Noctes Atticæ*, writing in the second century A.D., mentions the pig's antipathy towards marjoram as an *old* proverb—''Vetus adagium est, nihil cum fidibus graculo, nihil cum amaracino sui'' (*There is an old adage that a jackdaw has nothing to do with music, nor a pig with marjoram*).

In BACONIANA (April, 1944, p. 76), Mr. Edward D. Johnson alluded to the title page of the 1611 Spenser folio, saying:

> To any reasonably minded person it is quite obvious that the man dressed as a shepherd on the left-hand side of the frontispiece represents the Earl of Leicester, because above his head is his crest, a bear; and the lady dressed as a shepherdess on the right-hand side clearly represents Elizabeth because, above her head, is the lion of England. . . . . The medallion at the bottom shows a baby boar, now grown up, looking wistfully at the bush of Tudor roses, in front of which is a scroll containing the words, 'Non tibi spiro'—I breathe not for thee. In other words, the Tudor succession is not for Francis Bacon.

I mentioned in the July, 1944, BACONIANA that the bush bore no resemblance to a rose bush, but I could not identify it at the time. I was reading the Preface to Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, and paused when I came to:

> Those who neither wish instruction for themselves, nor assistance in instructing others, have no interest in its contents: *Sis sus, sis Divus: sum caltha, et non tibi spiro.*

It is thought that Coleridge composed this himself. The translation given in a phrase book which I consulted is ''Be you a pig, or be you a god, I am marjoram, and I do not exist for you.''

It is, however, remarkable that he should have known about the pig and marjoram association, and also its connection with ''Non tibi spiro.'' He uses it, as it is used on the *Arcadia*-Spenser title-pages to point out that the contents of a learned book are of too fine a

*Lucretius, literally translated, reads: ''Swine shrink from mawjoram, and dread every kind of perfume: for that which seems at times to restore us, as it were, to life, is to the swine, strong poison. But mud, which is to most of us of us repulsive filth, seems clean and attractive to swine.''

THE FAERIE QVEEN:

THE

Shepheards Calendar:

Together

WITH THE OTHER

Works of England's Arch-Poët,

EDM. SPENSER:

¶ *Collected into one Volume, and carefully corrected.*

Printed by *H. L.* for *Mathew Lownes.*
Anno Dom. 1611.

flavour or smell for the vulgar liking. This work of Coleridge is very learned, and full of wise philosophy, written in Aphorisms similar to Bacon's *Novum Organum*. Latin and Greek quotations abound.

Had *The Ancient Mariner* and *Aids to Reflection* been anonymous, or published under the names of Coleridge and another respectively, nobody would have suspected that they came from the same man.

It will be noticed that Coleridge uses the word "caltha" for marjoram. This is curious, as it has generally been thought to mean either marigold or chrysanthemum. Some dictionaries give it as a plant of unknown variety. Only one authority I have consulted gives "marjoram." However, there is no doubt as to what is *intended*. Virgil, in Eclogue II (49-50), has:

> tum casis atque aliis intexens suavibus herbis mollia luteola
> pingit vaccinia caltha.

Here "caltha" is named in conjunction with "other sweet herbs." The Romans had alternative names for many plants and flowers, and consequently translation is very difficult, and sometimes impossible.

In BACONIANA, October, 1944, Mr. Biddulph reproduced an emblem from a book by Camerarius, dated about 1590. This shows a pig with his snout pointing up at a plant in a large pot. The Latin lines underneath tell us that it is marjoram, though otherwise it would be almost impossible to recognise it. These lines read:

> Pravis est animis virus doctrina salubris:
> Sic lutulens fugitat porcus amaracinum.

The meaning is that "Healthy instruction is poison to the debased mind. Thus flees the pig from marjoram for the filth." Above the emblem are the words, so often coupled with the pig and marjoram combination, "Non tibi spiro." In the words I have quoted from Coleridge, they are also applied to instruction not being liked by the "vulgar."

The intention of the device on the *Arcadia*-Spenser title-pages is, therefore, to indicate that the book is "caviare to the general," which is perfectly true. No other meaning can be attached to it.

The first edition of the *Arcadia* bears, on the title-page, the Sidney coat-of-arms, with the motto "Quo fata vocant." In the 1593 edition, the Sidney crest has been turned into a compromise between the porcupine and a boar—the bristles on the back still preserving the appearance of the quills of the original. The explanation would appear to be that Bacon had much to do with the authorship of the *Arcadia* in the augmented form in which it now appears—seven years after Sidney's death. It may, on the other hand, represent "the bristly Arcadian boar" (see Lucretius, V, 25).

We come now to the principal figures of the design. They stand for the two chief characters in the *Arcadia*. On the left, under the bear, is Musidorus, and, on the right, under the lion, Pyrocles. This is in allusion to the episode in the First Book of the slaying of a bear

by Musidorus, and of a lion by Pyrocles. Musidorus is shown as a shepherd, which disguise he takes under the name of "Dorus," while Pyrocles is represented as an Amazon—he having assumed this disguise under the name of "Zelmane." As such, they slay a bear and a lion respectively in defence of their ladies. Compare the figure of the shepherd with the description of "Dorus":

> But before she (Zelmane) could come to the Arbour, she sawe walking from her-ward, a man in a sheapperdish apparel who, being in sight of the lodge, it might seeme he was allowed there. A long cloke he had on, but that cast under his right arme, wherein he held a shephooke, so finely wrought that it gave a bravery to poverty: and his rayments, though they were meane, yet received they handsomness by the grace of the wearer; though he himselfe went but a kinde of languishing pace, &c.

As to "Zelmane," we are told:

> Upon her bodie she ware a doublet of skie colour sattin, covered with plates of gold and, as it were, nailed with pretious stones that in it she might seeme armed; the nether parts of her garments were so full of stuffe, and cut after such a fashion that, though the length of it reached to the ankles, yet in her going one might sometimes discerne the small of her leg which, with the foot, was dressed in a short paire of crimson velvet buskins, in some places open (as the ancient manner was) to show the fairness of the skin. Over this she ware a certaine mantell, made in such manner, that coming under the right arme, and covering most of that side, it had no fastening on the left side, but onely upon the top of the shoulder. On the same side on her thigh shee ware a sword, which witnessed her to be an Amazon, or one following that profession.

In BACONIANA, October, 1944, there was a letter from Mrs. Kate Prescott, which I found most helpful towards elucidating the meaning of the design. She pointed out that in the French edition of the *Arcadia*, in 1624, the shepherd now holds the *paw* of a bear, and the Amazon, the *head* of a lion. No stronger confirmation is required as to the fact that what have been mistaken for Leicester and Elizabeth are Musidorus and Pyrocles. In the First Book, Musidorus ("Dorus") presents the *paw* of the bear to Pamela, and Pyrocles ("Zelmane") the *head* of the lion to Philoclea.

I have not written in any desire to be critical. We are all liable to make mistakes, and certainly there were reasons here to believe that the title-page revealed "corroborative detail, intended to give artistic verisimilitude to a bald and unconvincing narrative."

The incorrect interpretation has been revived at intervals over a long period, and it is necessary that the matter should be put right. Otherwise, it will be handed down to future Baconians, and possibly repeated in their writings. It is better that correction should come from within than that it should be left open for one of our opponents "to make sport withal."

MONTAIGNE'S ESSAYS.

Part I.

THE Florio Edition of Montaigne's Essays, dated 1632, has a most elaborate title page showing a gateway, through which is seen a number of buildings and broken arches, the perspective being most extraordinary. Opposite this picture are some verses, in which the author informs his readers that every leafe and angle in the picture contains some secret meaning. The readers are invited to find out the mystery, and at the end of these verses we find out the significant words:—

> "*Pray passe along*, and stare no more on that
> Which is the *Picture* of *you know not what*.
> Yet if it please you, *spell it*, and if then
> You understand not, *Give them roome that can*."

His readers are here told *to spell the Picture* if they can. Among the addresses which appear at the beginning of this book is one address to John Florio, the supposed translator, signed Sam Daniel, and in this address we find the following lines:—

> "Wrap Excellence up never so much
> In hierogliphiques, ciphers, characters,
> And let her speak never so strange a speech
> Her genius yet findes apt decipherers."

Here we find the word Hieroglyphics, which means systems of writings in which figures of objects take the place of ordinary signs, which clearly applies to the enigmatical picture on the title page of this book.

It would be an interesting experiment if the readers of "Baconiana" would study this pictorial title page to Montaigne's Essays, write out their deductions, and then submit them to the Editor of "Baconiana" to see if they agree in any particular.

The following items on the title page (among others) require elucidation:—

1. In the verses opposite the picture we find the line

> "To fixe the author's title on the Gate."

To fix means to set or place *permanently*. If we look at the Picture we see that the author's title is not carved on the Gateway, but it is written on a scroll hooked on to a nail, so it can at any time be unhooked and possibly reveal the author's title underneath it.

2. We find in the verses the following lines:—

> "That every reader passing to and fro
> By casting thereupon a *glancing* eye
> Might in that model or Epitome
> (Ev'n at the first aspect) informed have beene
> Of ev'ry Raritie contd within."

The word glancing can be taken to mean obliquely, and obliquely means aslant. If we look at the picture from the right hand side we see the two arches in the middle distance form the letter B. In front of them is a broken arch, which reversed forms the letter F. This broken arch showing F reversed and the two whole arches showing B are practically the same as those which appear on page 53 of Whitney's "Choice of Emblems."

3. Looking through the gateway on the left hand side we see part of a circular building which might be taken to represent the Globe Theatre, having regard to the fact that on or behind it is a chimney on top of which is a Globe. The position of this globe would prevent any smoke coming out of the chimney.

4. In the foreground are two steps, obviously out of position as they do not lead to any doorway but are up against a solid wall.

5. On the left hand side of the gateway is a niche for a statue, but there is nothing in it. There is no corresponding niche on the other side of the gateway, but instead a slit through which light is streaming.

6. Through the left hand arch at the back we see part of a building, but the rest of the building does not appear at the back of the adjoining arch. It, therefore, looks as though this building was standing on the edge of a cliff, as it has no background.

7. If we look at the picture upside down the stone in the foreground and its shadow turn into a sea view with a cliff and sand on the left hand side and black and light clouds on the horizon.

8. We find in the verses the following lines:—

> "For, in these *angles* and among these *leaves*
> Wherein the rash *Beholder's* eye perceives
> No shewes or promises, of such choice things
> A diligent unfolder of them brings
> Concealed *Fruits* to light."

The Reader is here clearly told that there is something more in the title page than meets the eye on a cursory glance at it, and the Reader is requested to be a diligent unfolder so that he may see the true meaning of the various objects depicted in the picture.

Returning to the line "For in these angles and among these leaves;" the only leaves which appear in the picture are those at the top of the four columns, which seem to be in the form of crowns. Above the leaves we see rosettes. On the pillar on the left hand side of the gateway the rosette has 6 petals, but the rosette on the opposite pillar has 7 petals. At the top of half of the pillar shown on the left hand side up against the margin are 3 circles, and at the top of the half of the pillar shown on the right hand side are also 3 circles.

Looking through the gateway we see what looks like the spire of a church surmounted by a round ball and a cross, but it is not clear if

THE ESSAYES OR MORALL, POLITIKE AND MILITARIE Discourses of Lo: MICHAEL de Montaigne, Knight Of the noble Order of S. MICHAEL, and one of the Gentlemen in Ordinary of the French Kings Chamber.

THE THIRD EDITION

Wherunto is now newly added an Index of the principall matters & personages Mentioned in this Booke

LONDON
Printed by M. flesher for Rich. Royston in Iuie-lane next the exchequer Office
M DCXXXII

To the Beholder of this Title.

VVHen firſt this portlike *Frontiſpeece* was wrought,
To raiſe a *Pile* compleat, it was our thought,
Whoſe *Roomes* and *Galleries* ſhould have been trim'd
With *Emblemes*, and with *Pictures*, fairly lim'd,
And drawne from thoſe neat *Peeces*, which do lurke
Within the *Cloſets* of this *Authors* worke:
So placing them, and them contriving ſo,
That ev'ry *Reader* (paſſing to and fro)
By caſting thereupon a glauncing eye,
Might in that *Model* or *Epitomie*,
(Ev'n at the firſt aſpect) inform'd have beene,
Of ev'ry *Rarities* contain'd within.
But walking through that *Place* of *Invention*,
(The better to accompliſh our intention)
Wee found unlookt for, ſcattred here and there,
Such *Profits*, and ſuch pleaſures, ev'ry where,
In ſuch *Variety*, that, to but name
Each one, would make a *Volume* of the ſame.
For, in thoſe *Angles*, and among thoſe *Leaves*
Whereon the raſh *Beholders* eye perceives
No ſhewes or promiſes, of ſuch choice things,
A diligent unfolder of them brings
Concealed *Fruits* to light: Ev'n thus did we
In ſuch abundance, that they prove to bee
Beyond a briefe *expreſſion*, and have ſtop't
Our purpoſe in preſenting what wee hop'd.
In ſtead of *Emblemes* therefore, to explaine
The ſcope of this great *Volume*, we are faine
To fixe the *Authors Title*, on the *Gate*,
Annexed to his *Name*; preſuming that
Will give this following *Treatiſe* much more praiſe
Then all the *Trophies* which our skill can raiſe.
For, he that hath not heard of *Mountaine* yet,
Is but a novice in the ſchooles of *wit*.
You that ſo pleaſe may enter: For, behold
The *Gate* ſtands open, and the *doores* unfold
Their leaves to entertaine you. That French *ward*
Which lately kept you forth, is now unbard,
And you may paſſe at pleaſure ev'ry way
If you are furniſh'd with an *Engliſh-key*.
That, wee ſuppoſe you want not: If you do,
Wee are not they, whom *this* was meant unto:
Pray paſſe along, and ſtare no more on that
Which is the *Picture* of *you know not what*.
Yet, if it pleaſe you *Spell it*, And if than
You underſtand not, *Give them roome that can*.

this spire is attached to the masonry above the left side arch or to the traight post by the side of the building in the far distance. This post seems to have a reflection, so it may be that this building is standing in the sea and not on a cliff. Inside the gateway on the left hand side is a doorway, but the masonry is extended over the door which would prevent the door from being opened outwards and would be an obstruction to anyone entering the building, which apparently has no roof.

BACON'S AND SHAKESPEARE'S EYES.

By W. Russell Brain.

WHILE looking at the portraits of Bacon in Mr. Eagle's book, "Shakespeare, New Views for Old," I noticed that in both the portraits reproduced facing page 107, there is an abnormality of the left eye. The left upper lid droops. This abnormality known as ptosis, is not very rare, and has various causes. It appears in the first portrait of Bacon at the age of eighteen, at which age the only common cause is a congenital malformation. Congenital ptosis would remain unchanged throughout life, and the lid appears exactly the same in the portrait representing Bacon at the age of sixty. Seeking confirmation in other portraits I turned to "Francis Bacon—a new Portrait" (in Baconiana, 1941, 25, 292), and was both surprised and interested to find the abnormality present in this portrait also, but on the *right* side, and in the engraving "from Sylva Sylvarum" which is reproduced as plate 1, in Durning-Lawrence's book, "Bacon is Shakespeare," the right eye again is the smaller, and the right eyebrow at a lower level than the left.

These observations made me curious about Shakespeare's eyes and it appears to me that the eyes in the Droeshout engraving are both *right* eyes. Normally the right and left eyes are mirror images of one another. In both, the angle made by the lids where they meet at the end nearest the nose is less acute than the angle at the outer end: the inner half of the upper lid itself is narrower than the outer half, and the eyebrow is also narrower and denser at its inner than at its outer end. In all these respects it will be seen that the left eye of the Droeshout figure is an almost exact copy of the right eye and not its mirror image; and if the right eye, nose and mouth are covered, it will be seen that the "left" eye is really another right eye.

I must leave the explanation of these puzzles to others better equipped to say whether any light is thrown upon the Shakespeare mystery by Shakespeare's two right eyes or Bacon's "one auspicious and one dropping eye."

THIS FIGURE TWO.

By Edward D. Johnson.

THE first six lines on the first page of the First Folio of Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies are:—

To the Reader

T*his Figure, that thou here seest put,*
It was for gentle Shakespeare cut;
Wherein the graver had a strife
With Nature, to out-doo the life:
O, could he but have drawne his *wit*.

The first line is "This Figure that thou here seest put," and the first letters of the 1st, 3rd and 5th lines in the outer margin, which stand out boldly, are T W O = Two—otherwise "This Figure Two that thou here seest put." The Playwright is clearly drawing the reader's attention to the word TWO in the outer margin. Observe also that the last word in the 5th line is WIT, and the first letters in the first three lines read upwards also spell WIT.

Anyone who is familiar with Francis Bacon's methods will know that there is always a reason for everything that he does, and as the reader's attention is drawn to the word TWO the reader has to discover the reason why the word TWO is shewn on the first page of the First Folio. If we turn to page TWO in the Comedies we find that the first letters in 17 consecutive lines in the first column of this page are:

(D
(Tis Time
(I
(A
(L
 T
(T
(I
(S

(N
(B
 W S
(F
(Y
(B
(AN
(CON

We find in the margin the word DIAL=the face of a timepiece; which has reference to the word Time in the text. Observe that the second of these lines is inset so as to enable the four letters in the margin to spell DIAL.

We next find in the margin TIS—a shortened form of IT IS.

The next two letters in the margin are N B—an abbreviation of NOTA BENE, Latin for NOTE WELL. The first letter and the first letter of the last word in the next line are W (William) and S (Shakespeare). The next four letters in the margin are F B A C, the remainder of the signature formed of the 2nd and 3rd letters in the next two lines, which gives:

F		F
B		B
A	also	AN
CON		CO

Exactly opposite this signature F BACON, in the second column of this page TWO the first letters in five consecutive lines are:

(T
(W
(O

(A
(LIKE

which gives TWO ALIKE—a reference to the two signatures *exactly* opposite in the first column of this page, namely:

F		F
B	and	B
A		AN
CON		CO

The word TWO on the first page of the First Folio has therefore drawn the reader's attention to *two* signatures on page *Two* of the Comedies.

Now turn to page TWO of the Histories.

The CON of BACON is on the 36th line down the 1st column of page 2 in the Comedies. The first letter on the 36th line up the 1st column of page 2 in the Histories is W, the first words on the two lines above it being AY—which gives a word WAY, which here would seem to mean plan or position. The letter W of the word TWO in the margin of the *2nd* column of page 2 of the *Comedies* is on the 35th line down this column. The first words in the 35th line down the 2nd column of page 2 in the Histories are TIS TWO—thus showing the reader that there is no doubt that the letters T in the 2nd column

W
O

of page 2 in the Comedies are to be read as a word TWO.

Now turn to page TWO in the Tragedies.

The first three words on the 33rd line up the 1st column of this page are NOTE ME THIS, and on the 33rd line up the 1st column of page 2 in the Comedies the first letter is B, part of the signature BACON already referred to.

As already shown, the letter W of the word TWO in the margin of the 2nd column of page 2 of the Comedies is on the 35th line down this column. The first word on the 35th line down the 2nd column of the 2nd page in the Tragedies is HANG—drawing the reader's attention to the fact that Francis Bacon has been making words HANG in the margin of the 1st and 2nd columns of page 2 in the Comedies, page 2 in the Histories, and page 2 in the Tragedies. Now turn to the page which is page TWO from the end of the First Folio (the page numbered 398 in Cymbeline), where we find that the 1st word on the 33rd line up the 1st column of this page is TWO, which draws attention to the word TWO written in the margin of the 2nd column of page 2 in the Comedies, where the 1st letter on the 33rd line up this column is T, part of the word TWO in the margin as already shown.

The word TWO shown on the 1st page of the First Folio has therefore drawn our attention to page 2 in the Comedies, page 2 in the Histories, page 2 in the Tragedies, and the reverse page 2 in the First Folio, and to the signatures:

F	F	T	
B	B	W	
A	AN	O	WAY TIS TWO
CON	CO	ALIKE	

NOTE ME THIS HANG and TWO

The simple count of the word TWO is 54, thus—

T	=	19
W	=	21
O	=	14
		54

On page 54 in the Histories we find the word BACON in the exact centre of the 25th line down, which is also the 25th line up from the end of the scene in the second column of this page.

On the true page 54 (wrongly numbered 56) in the Histories in the first column we find the word FRANCIS 20 times. The Reader can decide for himself if these are all coincidences.

BACON'S NEW METHOD RE-EXAMINED.

By W. G. C. Gundry.

"All truth is a shadow except the last; but every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance."

Isaac Pennington.

THE bomb which blitzed the plinth of Francis Bacon's fine bronze statue in Gray's Inn, which he loved so well, left the inscription mutilated. In May, 1943, the present writer made a copy of it; it appeared approximately as follows:—

. . . . . IO MAGNA ET
. . . . . (O)RGANUM
. . . . . OF THE REIGN
. VII
. . . . . (G) NITATE AUGMENTIS
. . . . . ARUM[1]

"When wasteful war shall statues overturn,
And broils root out the work of masonry,
Nor Mars his sword, nor war's quick fire shall burn
The living record of your memory."

Sonnet 55.

The statue itself had disappeared; presumably it had been removed at the orders of the Masters of the Bench to a place of safety to escape the risk of further damage from German bombing aircraft. How symbolic the defaced inscription is of the neglect into which Bacon's *New Method* has fallen!

The writer could not help reflecting upon the contrast between Hitler's *New Order* and Bacon's *New Method*; on the one hand the tyranny of man's desire for domination for selfish ends; on the other the benevolent intention to benefit the whole human family by obedience to Divine Law.

Baconians have for the most part concentrated their attention on proving Bacon's authorship of the Plays known as Shakespeare's. To effectively accomplish this would be no mean achievement, indeed, to many of us it is already done, though most of the world is either antagonistic or merely apathetic; sometimes it is rude and attempts ridicule, as when Mr. Pearsall Smith writes of: "herds of Baconian

[1] The letters in brackets were partially defaced. The exact spacing is not guaranteed.—W.G.C.G.

believers as they plunge squeaking down the Gadarene slope of their delusion.''[1]

But even when Bacon's authorship gains universal acceptance surely this is only the beginning of our quest! We are but at the entrance of the Baconian labyrinth; we have yet before us the co-ordination of Bacon's philosophy and the truths contained in the Shakespeare Plays.

Some few Baconian writers have written upon Bacon's *New Method* and the deeper implications of the Plays,[2] and the concensus of opinion among these writers appears to be that these are complementary, the plays being Bacon's philosophic sporangium for germinating scientific truth and causing it to bear fruit for the benefit of posterity:

''Igneus est ollis vigor, et coelestis origo.''

What, briefly, is the *New Method* which Bacon proposed and how did it differ from previous philosophic systems? The answer to the first part of the question is that Bacon envisaged a vast number of experiments in every scientific field in order to supply data, by means of which and his inductive system, to establish axioms which could be reduced by classification and selection to a comparatively compact and manageable body of laws or elementary FORMS which would constitute an A.B.C. of Nature, by the use of which her secrets could be spelt out and new inventions found. These axioms were to be used to maintain the investigation in the proper channel of inquiry and to

[1] Why squeaking? A grunt is the more usual suilline method of evincing satisfaction; but perhaps Mr. Pearsall Smith was only thinking of young pigs —Baconian tyros? On the other hand he may have had in mind Edwin Bormann's translation of one of Bacon's cryptic Latin verses:—

''What though a pig,
Perchance may dig
And print an A i' the ground with burrowing greedy snout
Do you think it possible, say, a tragic play such a pig
Could essay
Like the A?
Who would doubt such conceit were—big!''

[2] The Philosophy of the Shakespeare Plays, Delia Bacon, U.S.A., 1857.
A New Study of Shakespeare, W. F. C. Wigston, London, 1884.
Bacon, Shakespeare and The Rosicrucians, W. F. C. Wigston, 1888.
The Authorship of Shakespeare, Judge Holmes, U.S.A., 188?.
Der Shakespeare Geheimniss, Edwin Bormann, trans. H. Brett, London, 1905.
Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light, Dr. Theobald.
The Plays of Shakespeare Founded on Literary Forms, Henry J. Ruggles, U.S.A.
The Shakespeare Enigma, Father William A. Sutton, S.J.
The Tempest, A Mystery Play, Colin Still.
The Shakespeare Symphony, Harold Bayley.
Bacon's New Method, Parker Woodward, BACONIANA, October, 1905.
Shakespeare's Delineation of the Passion of Anger, F. C. Hunt, BACONIANA, July, 1910.
St. Alban's Helmet, J. E. Roe, BACONIANA, October, 1910.

act like the halteres of certain insects which keep their wings in the same plane of rotation.[1]

Bacon says, in his *Novum Organum*: "For I form a history and tables of discovery for anger, fear, shame and the like; for matters political; and again for the mental operations of memory, composition and division, judgment and the rest; not less than for heat and cold, or light, or vegetation, or the like.[2]

Spedding writes at the conclusion of the preface to the *Novum Organum* that the method of induction which he (Bacon) proposes is applicable not only to what is called natural philosophy, as distinguished from logic, ethics, and politics, but to every department of knowledge; the aim being to obtain an insight into the nature of things by processes varied according to the conditions of the subject.[3]

Elsewhere Spedding writes: "His (Bacon's) peculiar system of philosophy—that is to say, the peculiar method of investigation, the *'organum,'* the *'formula,'* the *'clavis,'* the *'ars ipsa interpretandi,'* the *'filum labyrinthi,'* or by whichever of its many names we choose to call that artificial process by which alone he believed that man could attain a knowledge of the laws and a command over the powers of nature—of this philosophy we can make nothing."[4]

One or two passages from Spedding's preface to the *Parasceve* may be quoted as illustrative of the difficulties with which an investigator is faced in examining Bacon's *New Method*. Thus Spedding: —"But if I may trust Herschel, I must think that it is the Galilean philosophy that has been flourishing all these years; and if I may trust my own eyes and power of construing Latin, I must think that the *Baconian* philosophy has yet to come."[5]

Again he writes: "John Mill observes that Bacon's method of inductive logic is defective, but does not advert to the fact that of ten separate processes which it was designed to include, the first only has been explained."[6]

And again: "It may be that Bacon's project was visionary, or it may be that it is only *thought* visionary, because since his death no heart has been created large enough to believe it practicable. The philosophers must settle that among themselves. But be the cause

[1] Diptera—mosquitos, gnats, etc.
"Although the haltere is not in the strict sense a rotating body, by its swinging to and fro through an arc of ninety degrees it must be regarded as an alternating gyroscope."—G. Fraenkel in "Proc. Zool. Socy." May, 1939.

[2] *Novum Organum* Aphorism CXXVII.

[3] This passage occurs in the preface to the *Novum Organum*, written for the most part by Robert Leslie Ellis but the conclusion is by J. Spedding and this passage is his. Mr. Ellis was prevented by illness from finishing the preface.

[4] *Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon* edited by J.M. Robertson, page X, of Editor's Introduction quoting Spedding in his and Ellis's preface to the third part of their edition of Bacon's Works. Robertson's edition of Bacon's Philosophical Works is used throughout this article. W.G.C.G.

[5] P. 391, Robertson's edition.

[6] P. 394, ibid.

what it will it is clear to me on the one hand that the thing has not been seriously attempted, and, on the other, that Bacon was fully satisfied that nothing of worth could be hoped for without it; therefore we have no right to impute to him either the credit of all that has been done by the new philosophy, or the discredit of all that has been left undone."[1]

As to the missing "clavis" it may be that this was that work of his, the *Abcedarium Naturae* which his chaplain, Dr. Rawley, stated was lost.[2] Perhaps, however, it was not lost but may have been consigned for safe keeping to a private succession:

> "That to my use it might unused stay
> From hands of falsehood, in sure wards of trust."
>
> *Sonnet* 48.

If so, it may have comprised a partial *Alphabet of Nature* which Bacon had been able to form as the result of his collection of facts or axioms up to the time of its compilation. But the question has been asked regarding the difference between Bacon's system and those which preceded it.

When Francis Bacon was a youth at Cambridge he revolted against the authority of Aristotle and the undue reverence that the schoolmen of his and earlier times accorded him; he gives expression to this when he writes: "Here therefore (is) the first distemper of learning when men study words and not matter.[3] He noted that much of the so-called science of his day was occupied with fruitless disputations on the words and works of ancient authors.[4]

He says in *The Advancement of Learning*: "For the wit and mind of man, if it work upon matter, which is the contemplation of the creatures of God, worketh according to the stuff, and is limited thereby; but if it work upon itself, as the spider worketh his web, then it is endless, and bringeth forth indeed cobwebs of learning, admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit." Bacon desired to jettison "the profane novelties of terms and oppositions of science, falsely so-called" and begin at the beginning by establishing axioms by means of experiment: "Our hope is to begin the whole labour of the mind again," he says; and again: "As water ascends no higher than the level of the first spring, so knowledge derived from Aristotle will at most rise no higher than the knowledge of Aristotle."[5]

Francis Bacon, by a curious coincidence, shared with his great

[1] P. 395, ibid.

[2] Dr. William Rawley's *Life of Bacon*, prefixed to *Resuscitatio* 1671.

[3] See Bishop Wilkins *Essay towards a Real Character and Philosophical Language*, 1688;
Bacon's reference to Raymond Lullius and Books of *Typocosmy*, A.O.L., Bk. II;
The Meaning of Meaning, C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards.
The Loom of Language, Frederick Bodmer; and
The Gift of Tongues, Margaret Schlauch.

[4] Such, for instance, as the discussion on the hylomorphic composition of angels.

[5] The Advancement of Learning.

namesake, Roger Bacon (1214-1294), a great part of his *New Method*. There is a curious parallel between the two men's outlook. Both were uncompromising in their championship of what each considered to be the truth. Roger Bacon writes of a rival scholar that his works have four faults: "boundless puerile vanity, ineffable falsity, superfluity of bulk, and ignorance of the most useful and beautiful parts of philosophy."[1] He dismissed the Mediaeval philosophy of his day as a compound of four errors: "of obsequiousness to authority, ingrained habits of thought, deference to the unlettered crowd, and the empty ostentation of knowledge."

Compare these with the *idols* of Francis Bacon. These are: *Idols of the Tribe*, *Idols of the Cave*, *Idols of the Market place* and *Idols of the Theatre*.

"*The Idols of the Tribe* are those fallacies which arise from the very structure of men's minds; for example, when we jump to a general conclusion on the basis of one example."

"*The Idols of the Cave* are the errors peculiar to the individual; for example, when a man thinks a subject is specially important because he himself has studied it."

"*The Idols of the Market* are the errors caused by the misleading use of words." In this connection the recent popular treatment of semantics, or the science of meaning, should be noted.

"*The Idols of the Theatre* are the narrow systems of philosophy which have hitherto gained currency in the world."[2]

There is a strong family likeness between Roger Bacon's attitude to the stultifying scholasticism of his day and that of Francis Bacon towards the scholiasts of his, three centuries later.[3] Roger Bacon refused to read Aristotle in the accepted Latin translations, learnt Greek and then declared that, if he had his way every translation of Aristotle would be burned.[4]

But in returning to a consideration of *Bacon's New Method* it is desirable that the outlines of his plan should be tabulated. Bacon planned a sequence of six large works as follows:—

I. *Partitiones Scientiarum*, or *The Division of the Sciences*. This part is represented by *De Augmentis Scientiarum* and *The Advancement of Learning*. These books are a survey of the state of knowledge as it existed in Bacon's time.

II. *Interpretatio Naturae*, or *The Interpretation of Nature*, which reveals the method by means of which the human mind is to be directed in its work of renewing science. This part is supplied by the *Novum Organum*.

III. *Historia Naturalis et Experimentalis*, a *Natural and Experimental History*; this contains observed facts in nature and is

[1] *British Philosophers*. Kenneth Matthews. London, 1943.
[2] *British Philosophers*.
[3] Komensky in his *Physica* says: 'Verulamius and Campanella are the two Hercules that have vanquished the monster Aristotle."
[4] *British Philosophers*.

the basis of the structure of Bacon's philosophy, and it comprises *Historia Ventorum*. *Historia Vitae et Mortis*, *Historia Densi et Rari* and *Sylva Sylvarum*.

IV. *Scala Intellectus*, or *The Ladder of the Intellect*; this division appears to be represented only by a fragment of a few pages called *Filum Labyrinthi*, or *The Thread of the Labyrinth*. It is endorsed in Bacon's own hand *Ad Filios* and was found among his papers after his death. Presumably the endorsement refers to those "*Aurorae Filii* (Sons of the Morning) whom he hoped would carry on the campaign which he had inaugurated, those whom he believed would hear the bell which he was ringing "to call other wits together."

Bacon intended that this "ladder of the intellect" should consist of types and examples of the manner in which the new method worked in order that the mind might readily grasp the rings of ascent and descent and thus become versed in its use.

Except for *Filum Labyrinthi*, there is apparently nothing to fill this division in Bacon's acknowledged works. In the twenty-first aphorism the *Scala Ascensoria et Descensoria Axiomatum* is mentioned but not explained; it is presumably connected with the *Scala Intellectus*.

V. *Prodromi*, or *Anticipations of the New Philosophy*. This was to be separate from the general design but, perhaps, ancillary to it, and was to contain speculations of Bacon's own by the unassisted use of his understanding. Spedding thinks that the following treatises were to be included in this division: *De Principiis*, *De Fluxu et Refluxu*, *Cogitationes de Natura Rerum*, but is by no means certain that this is so.

VI. *The New Philosophy*, which is the work of future ages and the result of the *New Method*.[1]

Bacon commends the speculation of Plato and Parmenides: "that all things by scale did ascend to unity." This idea seems to be the basis of his system which is essentially a Christian one in ascribing all things to the Divine Creator of the Cosmos.

In the second book of *The Advancement of Learning* he says: "For knowledges are as pyramids, whereof history is the basis; so of Natural Philosophy the basis is Natural History; the stage next the basis is Physic; the stage next the vertical point is Metaphysic. As for the vertical point, '*opus quod operatur Deus a principio usque ad finem*,'" the Summary Law of Nature, we know not whether man's inquiry can attain unto it. But these three be the true stages of knowledge; and are to them that are depraved no better than the giants' hills (Pelion, Ossa and Olympus) piled upon each other, but to those which refer all things to the glory of God, they are as the

[1] See an anonymous compilation entitled ' Bacon and the Drama," which appeared in the Tercentenary Number of BACONIANA, April 1926, from which this table of divisions is, for the most part, taken: it is really that of Spedding!

three acclamations, *Sancte, Sancte, Sancte*;[1] holy in the description or dilatation of His works, holy in the connection or concatenation of them, and holy in the union of them in a perpetual and uniform law. And therefore the speculation was excellent in Parmenides and Plato, although but a speculation in them, 'that all things by scale did ascend to unity.' ''

Both Plato and Aristotle arrived at the conclusion that our existence here was enveloped by illusion, though the former approached the problem from a metaphysical angle and the latter from a physical one. To quote Plato:—[2]

''And now, I said, let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened:—Behold! human beings living in an underground cave, which has a mouth open towards the light and reaching all along the cave; here they have been from their childhood and have their legs and necks chained so they cannot move, and can only see before them, being prevented by the chains from turning round their heads. Above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised bay; and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like the screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show the puppets.

''I see.

''And do you see, I said, men passing along the wall carrying all sorts of vessels, and statues and figures of animals made of wood and stone and various materials, which appear over the wall? . . . You have shown me a strange image, and they are strange prisoners. Like ourselves, I replied; and they see only their own shadows, or the other shadows which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave?

''True, he said: how could they see anything but the shadows if they were never allowed to move their heads?

''And of the objects which are being carried in like manner they would only see the shadows?

''Yes, he said.

''To them, I said, the truth would be literally nothing but the shadow of the images.''

Now hear Bacon on the same theme:—''Let us consider again the false appearances imposed upon us by every man's own individual nature and custom,[3] in that feigned supposition that Plato maketh of the cave: for certainly if a child were continued in a grot or cave under the earth until maturity of age, and came suddenly abroad, he would have strange and absurd imaginations; so in like manner, although our spirits are included in the caves of our own complexions and customs, which minister unto us infinite errors and vain opinions, if they be not recalled to examination.

But hereof we have given many examples in one of the errors, or peccant humours, which we ran briefly over in our first book.

[1]Italics as printed in Robertson's edition of *Bacon's Philosophical Works*, page 95.

[2]Plato's Republic, Book VII.

[3]Idols of the Cave.

And lastly, let us consider the false appearances that are imposed upon us by words,[1] which are framed and applied according to the conceit and capacities of the vulgar sort, and although we think we govern our words, and prescribe it well, *Loquendum ut vulgus sentiendum ut sapientes*, yet certain it is that words, as a Tartar's bow, shoot back on the understanding of the wisest, and mightily entangle and pervert the judgment."

In *The Advancement of Learning*[2] Bacon says: "But we, illuminated with divine Revelation, disclaiming these rudiments and delusions of the senses, know that not only the mind, but the affections purified: not only the souls, but the body shall be advanced in its time to immortality."

"*Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem facie ad faciem.*"

Or, as Shakespeare puts it in *The Tempest*: "We are such stuff as dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded with a sleep."[3] And again, in *The Merchant of Venice*: "Such harmony is in immortal souls; but, whilst this muddy vesture of decay doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it."

(*To be continued*).

LECTURE GIVEN AT HIGHBURY LITTLE THEATRE, SUTTON COLDFIELD, BIRMINGHAM.

On June 7th, last, our member Mr. Ed. D. Johnson gave a lecture by request of Mr. John English, the Art Director of the Little Theatre, Sutton Coldfield, on the Baconian authorship of the Shakespeare Plays. There was an enthusiastic attendance of the members of the Theatre group for the lecture which lasted an hour and a quarter. This was followed by a short interlude for coffee, after which the lecturer returned to the stage to answer questions which rained in for over an hour. However the lecturer met all questions to the satisfaction of the enquirers. There were 77 members of the Theatre group present, and the evening passed off with great success for the Baconian cause. Both the lecturer and our Hon. Secretary, Mr. Valentine Smith, had previously supplied for distribution and sale propaganda pamphlets which included, "Are you interested in Shakespeare?" "The Shakespeare Illusion"; "Will Shaksper's Portrait" amongst others. Our Society has to thank Mr. John English warmly for the invitation to give the lecture and Mr. Ed. D. Johnson for so ably coming forward to speak for the Society's great Cause.—L.B.

[1] Idols of the Market-place.
[2] A.O.L., Bk. I.
[3] The Tempest; Act IV, Sc. 1.
The Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Sc. 1.

BOOK REVIEW.

"SHAKESPEAREAN AFTERGLOW" by (Miss) C. M. Montgomery, M.A., Melbourne. Robertson and Mullens, Ltd., 4s. 6d. net.

Much publicity has been given to this book both by Pamela Hansford Johnson's broadcast in March, and by the full page review in "John O' London's Weekly," of 6th April. Now that a copy has reached me through the London House of the publishers, I have to confess to great disappointment, and to the fact that the publicity was undeserved. Nevertheless, the book is entertaining and interesting in parts, and, occasionally, quite enlightening. But we must judge by the whole effect rather than by individual flashes.

Miss Montgomery (formerly Principal Melbourne Girls' High School), says that her aim is "in the first place to refute, or at any rate modify, Ben Jonson's statement of 'small Latin' as applied to Shakespeare." That has already been done far more thoroughly, and at considerable length, by Sir George Greenwood in *The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated*, and other books from his pen; by Churton Collins in *Studies in Shakespeare*; by William Theobald in *The Classical Element in the Shakespeare Plays*; by Edwin Reed in *Francis Bacon our Shake-speare*, and others. Furthermore, if the passage in Ben Jonson's lines prefixed to the First Folio, containing the allusion to "small Latin and less Greek" be read with the context, it will be seen that there is no such statement, as the meaning appears to be "*even were it the case* that thou hadst small Latin and less Greek."

Her second aim is "to dispose of, once and for all, the theory that Bacon wrote the Plays commonly attributed to Shakespeare" (by whom she means William Shakspere of Stratford).

As with her predecessors who have made the same boast, she fails completely, and has merely succeeded in demonstrating the strength of the Baconian case, and the futility of the Stratford position.

Her reading of Bacon is limited to the few better known works which are included in popular editions, and this has led her to make false statements as to Bacon not having used certain words derived from Latin in the same sense as Shakespeare uses them. But she should have known that even in the familiar writings of Bacon, the word "secure" meaning "free from care" appears several times as, for instance, in the *Essay of Seditions* ("Neither let any prince, or State, be secure concerning discontentments").

On the next page (16), she quotes Bacon "It is a mere and miserable solitude to *want* true friends." This is a truth which Shakespeare frequently endorses, as when Richard II laments his state of being "barren and bereft of friends." However, it is not Miss Montgomery's *intention* to point out Bacon-Shakespeare parallelisms. She introduces the passage from Bacon to state, quite incorrectly, that "Shakespeare would not use *want* thus, but the word *lack*." There appears to be no Shakespeare *Concordance* available in Melbourne! Shakespeare *does* use "want" in this sense as frequently

as he uses "lack." He generally employed "want" in prose passages and "lack" in verse.*

She fails to understand that the choice of vocabulary, phrasing, simile, imagery and allusion must differ widely between dramatic pieces written mainly in verse, and philosophical prose works intended for special scholars and thinkers. The same applies to the use which the author made of his familiarity with the Latin language and literature. It is her omission to grasp this important fact which renders her work such a waste of time and material. She imagines that if Bacon had written the plays, we should encounter in the text a large number of Latin quotations such as we find in the Essays and other acknowledged works of Bacon. Yet at the same time, she gives Bacon the credit for being "logical." Why should he suddenly become illogical as the author of "Shakespeare?" Miss Montgomery knows better than this. She is out to state a case and to "refute" what she calls "the notion that Bacon wrote the Plays." And what nonsense she writes in her eagerness to achieve the impossible! On page 39, she says, "No *two* styles could be more diverse than the styles of Bacon and Shakespeare." Could anybody count the number of different styles which Bacon and Shakespeare respectively employed? I should not like to attempt such a task. Is the style of, say, *The Merry Wives* anything like that of *Antony and Cleopatra*? Is the style of Fenton that of Falstaff in the same play? Does Enobarbus speak the language of Cleopatra? Shakespeare used more than a hundred styles, and Bacon varies his according to the subject matter and the person or persons addressed. She notes "diluculo surgere" in *Twelfth Night*, but says nothing of Bacon's "Diluculo surgere saluberrimum est" in the *Promus*. Probably she has never heard of the *Promus*.

A curious mistake occurs on page 29, where Anne Page is made the mother of the boy, William. Why does she say, in the same paragraph, that Bacon "would never have put into Mrs. Quickly's mouth, "Hang hog is Latin for Bacon?" It is a typical Baconian touch for it was a family jest dating from the time of Sir Nicholas Bacon about a culprit named Hog, who pleaded to be spared on account of his kindred to Bacon. Sir Nicholas replied, "You and I cannot be kindred except you be hanged, for Hog is not Bacon until it be well hanged." The story is told in Bacon's *Apophthegms*. Another example of Miss Montgomery's distorted view may be quoted from page 29:

> "Although Bacon says that he (Bacon) was bad in Latin, he would never have written such stuff as ratolorum and custalorum, nor such a word as honorificabilitudinitatibus."

*"Extravant," in the sense of wandering without limit, is another of her examples of Shakespeare's classical word coinage. It is from *extra-vagari*. The Oxford Dictionary also gives the first use of it to *Hamlet* (I, i):

"the extravagant and erring spirit hies to his confines."

Bacon, however, was about ten years earlier in the unpublished Northumberland MS. speech, "The Praise of the worthiest Affection:"

"such extravagant and erring spirits."

How do you explain this, Miss Montgomery?

Now, "ratolorum" and "custalorum" occur in the first scene of *The Merry Wives*. They are, of course, corruptions from the legal term "Custos Rotulorum." meaning a "keeper of the rolls," or principal justice of the peace in a country. The corruption is put into the mouths of two foolish characters in the play—"Shallow" and "Slender." The long word appears in *Love's Labour's Lost* (4. 1.), and is spoken by the clown "Costard" during a battle of words. It is not Shakespeare's invention, but was a joke current among university men and other wits. It occurs in Beaumont and Fletcher (*Mad Lover*, I. 1.); in Nashe (*Lenten Stuffe*), and in Marston (*Dutch Courtezan*, V. 1). It dates back to the 15th century, as I have shown on page 38, of *Shakespeare: New Views for Old*. The word "Honorificabilitudine" occurs on the Baconian Northumberland Manuscript among Shakespeare and Bacon jottings.

It is unfortunate that books of the nature of *Shakespearean Afterglow* are handed for review to those who are not specialists in the subject and not, therefore, capable of seeing where the authors go wrong. I can well understand that, on the surface, the book would appear convincing. For instance, it should have been pointed out that while stating that "Bacon would not have written those three words, even though he said he was bad in Latin," Shakespeare whose "knowledge of Latin construction is unique"(p.29), would, apparently have done so! Bacon, incidentally, never said he was "bad in Latin."

There are some good examples of Shakespeare's sub-conscious use of his reading in Latin authors, and the Latin forms of construction so often found in the Plays. Her examples are confined to Virgil, Ovid, Horace and Cicero, but Shakespeare's familiarity with the classics was astounding in its extent and variety.

The next section of her book is headed "Dethroners of Shakespeare," and represents her idea of the arguments against the Baconians and Oxfordians, together with what appears to her to support the Stratford man. We have heard all this before, and have dealt with those points *ad nauseam*. There are, however, a few gems which deserve to be recorded. From these I have selected the following "comic strips:"

> "Doubtless Shakespeare (i.e., William of Stratford), knew more law than he ever made use of in the Plays." (p. 47).
>
> "Both he and his father had first hand experience in the Law Courts." (p. 47).
>
> (This is made to refer to John and William Shakspere, neither of whom "had first hand experience in the 'Law Courts'." Sir Nicholas and Francis Bacon were certainly qualified).
>
> "Probably much of Shakespeare's Italian colour resulted from descriptions heard or imagined at the 'Mermaid'."
>
> (Assuming, of course, that "Italian colour" *was* discussed, and that W.S., attended the meetings!)
>
> "No cultured poet of aristocratic outlook ever wrote the Shakespeare Plays!"

(This is flatly contradictory to the evidence afforded by the Plays. Morton Luce says that Shakespeare "nowhere identifies himself with the people, but writes as from some higher grade of society," *Handbook to Shakespeare's Works*, p.37).

"No one steeped in the classics ever wrote the plays!"

(Contradictory to the evidence in Miss Montgomery's first chapter and to the verdict of all competent authorities).

On page 55 she quotes from Emerson's Essay *Shakespeare; or the Poet*, but omits the famous conclusion:

"Other admirable men have led lives in some sort of keeping with their thought, but this man in wide contrast."

Like Emerson, Miss Montgomery also fails to "marry him to his verse." On the contrary, her book is but another confirmation as to the hopelessness of attempting to build up any case on such a rotten foundation as that of the Stratford tradition. It is a crazy hypothesis—as fantastic as anything produced by the topsy-turvy imagination of Heath Robinson.

R. L. EAGLE.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

BACON'S KNOWLEDGE OF MUSIC.

Sir,

Whilst reading Sir George Dyson's Address to the Royal College of Music, which was quoted in the February issue of "The Musical Times," I came across the following interesting paragraph:

"One striking fact is of great historical interest. The peak of general knowledge about music, as shown in our poets, occurs in the Elizabethan period, and the best informed of them all is Shakespeare. There are scores of references to music in Shakespeare, some of them highly technical. They are always apt, and they are always exact. So accurate are they that when, as sometimes happens, he refers to instruments now obsolete, the commentators who do not know the subject flounder hopelessly. An extreme example was the lecturer who thought that Shakespeare's 'Recorders' (in 'Hamlet') were legal officials. We can have more sympathy for anyone trying to explain the phrase 'dancing chips' in one of the sonnets. Shakespeare's 'dancing chips' are the jacks which pluck the strings in a spinet, and which jump up and down as one plays on the keys. You have to know even more than this, for one of his lines refers to the fact that if you take away the wooden rail which lies along the top of the jacks, and then press a key, holding your other hand over the jack, this jack will jump into your hand. It is hardly surprising that a modern commentor, with only a very general notion of music, and no knowledge whatever of these historical details of the subject, must either say nothing, or make serious mistakes."

What is known of Bacon's knowledge of music?

Yours, etc.,
E. B. HAMMERSLEY.

Bacon has a good deal to say about music in the Silva Silvarum, Century 2, sections 101 to 114; and again in Century 3, sections 278 to 282.—Editor.

Dear Mr. Biddulph,

R: AETHIOPICO-LATINUM LEXICON, by LUDOLPHUS.

Since writing to you last I have noticed that the Latin and Ethiopian

section of the Dictionary relating to Porcus (Pig, Bacon), appears on page 33; 33 is of course the code number of Bacon. It may very possibly be that this is the direct result of some form of designed manipulation as the Chapter relating to "P" begins a new page although it might just as well have been begun on the page before, as is the case elsewhere throughout the book.

Yours sincerely,

R. PANKHURST.

Dear Editor,

Not long ago I saw a reference to "Baconians" in an English Weekly: "the Baconians sometimes indulge in something like lunacy . . . . ." *Sometimes*, you will note . . . so it occured to me that the writer of this line *might be* a full-fledged Baconian (i.e., a member of our Society), or, he *might* be as ignorant of the Greatest Literary Mystery as a hog on ice.

Naturally he *could* be a Hawkshaw, a typical Baconian bloodhound, with a Library of 795 volumes, but still not in accord with Mr. Looney, Mr. Slater, Mr. Connes, Mr. Webb, Mr. Baxter, Mr. White, etc., etc., because some little conjecture had been offered which *he* didn't like.

And naturally, too, he may be a man of erudition and of great proficiency in his own line (modern morals and Religious Criticism), and as yet, *to date*, has never discovered that just about all the great writers of the World have taken a whirl at this Shakespeare question at some time or other.

After considerable effort and expense I have acquired some forty volumes on Shakespeare, Life and Times, and The Great Mystery (The *Unsolved* Mystery, as one author puts it!).

Through the years I have kept a list of literary folk, both celebrated and not so much, who are mentioned as having written articles, essays, or chit-chat, at sometime or other on *the Shakespeare Myth*. Actually it is amazing, if not a little astounding, to see this list of Intellectuals' names that goes back one hundred years! Space forbids listing. But you have all seen the same . . . perhaps more than I. Great names of the Hall of Fame; American, British, French and German. And even a few foreigners like Scandinavians and Irish. Pope, Coleridge, Carlyle, Guizot, Dickens, Bismarck, Holmes, Whittier, Disraeli, Ingersoll, Voltaire, Gladstone, Hawthorne, Gervinus . . . what did they have to say? Whether pro or con, who cares? Could it be anything but interesting?

We have *Omnibusi* on all subjects known to man. Why not one on the above idea? In my crude attempt, I am trying to show how interesting it appears if one had a collection of these Essays (arranged chronologically), as they were published down the years.

You can list me for a copy; any price.

EARLE CORNWALL.

To the Editor of BACONIANA,

SIR THOMAS LUCY'S DEER.

Sir,

With reference to Mr. R. L. Eagle's letter in the April issue of BACONIANA on the subject of Sir Thomas Lucy and Shakespere's alleged deer-stealing, I note that he quotes the late Sir George Greenwood as stating in his book *The Shakespeare Problem Restated and elsewhere* "that deer being *ferae naturae* and, therefore, not the subject of property, William could not have been prosecuted for 'deer-stealing' unless he took deer in 'a park impaled,' made by royal licence."

With the very greatest respect for the late Sir George Greenwood's legal knowledge and opinion I would venture to make the following observations. It is doubtful if the classification *ferae naturae* would include deer in England at any time since the Conquest, when William I, issued an Ordinance of the Forest, and by virtue of such classification give immunity to deer-stealers. The deer of the forest were essentially Royal Game and we read that the Conqueror "loved the high game as if he were their father." As Beasts of the Forest as well as of the Chase deer can hardly have been considered ownerless. They either belonged to the King, whose forests were under the jurisdiction

of two Chief Justices of the Forest, one for lands South of the Trent and the other for those lying to the North, or to a licensee with an impaled park. In some cases a deer park was held by a grant from the King, or in others, by prescription which presumed the existence of a grant issued at some long antecedent period, but then lost or mislaid. Offences against Forest Law were not triable under the Common Law but came before the Chief Justice of the Forest or the Verderers (Viridarii), his deputies.

It is true that by the time of Queen Elizabeth the Forest Laws had largely fallen into desuetude, though Charles I. made an unsuccessful attempt to enforce them when he sent his Chief Justices of the Forest to make raids on the forests and the freeholders.

To-day if the writer were to take and "break up" a hart or hind, which had strayed into the orchard here from Exmoor, it is to be doubted whether the plea of *ferae naturae* would avail one iota in a defence against a probable prosecution that would follow an attempt to increase his exiguous meat ration. In this case, however, he would not be answerable to the Chief Jusice of the Forest (south of the Trent), but probably to the Chief Commissioner of H.M. Woods and Forests, or possibly, to the outraged Master of the Devon and Somerset Staghounds

Yours faithfully,

W. G. C. GUNDRY.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. P. Pirovshikov of Atlanta, U.S.A., writes: if Bacon wrote Henry IV, parts 1 and 2; "As you Like it"; "Hamlet"; Macbeth;" "Othello" and "Lear," why did he not insert some ciphered indication of his authorship of them masterpieces? In the great Folio of 1623, we find "Henry IV, part 1.

The last speech in the play

contains Roman letter words	83
add Italic words	25
add roman words in brackets	3
equals Bacon in K cipher ..	111

"Henry IV, last scene (part 2); Roman words, 83, plus Italic words 31, equals 114; deduct roman words in brackets, 3; gives 111 again.

"As You Like It." Last page, last line of the two columns, contain 70 letters, deduct 4 italic letters in the word *exit*, which leaves 66. 66 is the cipher number of Fra Baconi (frequently so used).

"Macbeth:"

Last speech contains Roman words	129	
deduct Italic letters	19	
	110	
add one word, "finis"	1	
Bacon in K cipher ..	111	

"Hamlet":

Last page? Correct number is	174	L&$
deduct roman and Italic words in last speech ..	63	
Leaving		
Bacon in K cipher	111	

"Lear." Last line of each on last page have together 66 Roman letters equals code number of Fra Baconi.

"Othello:"

Last two lines of play have: Roman letters ..	72
deduct Italic letters	6
Cipher number of Fra Baconi ..	66

The same number (66) is found in the last two lines in each column of the actors names.